

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-24 will remain pending. Claims 1, 5, 10 and 23 will have been amended. Reconsideration of the Office Action of March 24, 2003 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-6, 10-14 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Densmore et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,187,786) in view of Brown et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,324,688). The Examiner asserted that Densmore et al. teaches generating a cache of information related to the classes and requesting a search of the class. The Examiner admitted that Densmore et al. fails to teach “searching the cache to satisfy the requested search.” Regarding this deficiency, the Examiner asserted that Brown et al. teach a “Class loader for finding [a] class stored in the memory as requested by searching.” Applicant respectfully traverses and submits that the prior art of record fails to teach, or suggest Applicant’s invention as now recited in the claims.

Each of independent claims 1, 5, 10, 15, 17, 22 and 23 recite, *inter alia*, a wrapper for providing a level of indirection from APIs. This feature advantageously enables the class path manager to make calls without having to be changed for different API calls as in the prior art, and enables multiple different caches to be used for different elements. Applicants submit that Densmore et al. and Brown et al. fail to teach at least this feature of the present invention.

The Examiner has indicated in paragraph 6 of the Office Action of March 224, 2003 that Whitehead et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,085,030) teaches “a wrapper for object in CORBA environment that invokes the object.” The wrapper disclosed in Whitehead et al. is used for non-CORBA objects, i.e., those objects that do not conform to the model. In other words, not

all objects in Whitehead et al. have wrappers. This teaches away from the present invention where wrappers are used for *all* elements. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The Examiner rejected claims 4, 7-9 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Densmore et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,187,786) in view of Brown et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,324,688) further in view of Becker (U.S. Patent No. 5,937,411). With respect to claim 4, the Examiner admitted that Densmore et al. and Brown et al. fail to teach “a zip file.” The Examiner asserted that Becker et al. remedies this deficiency and teaches a zip file as claimed. Applicants respectfully traverse.

As noted above, the combination of Densmore et al. and Brown et al. fail to teach at least a wrapper, as recited in the claims. As claims 4, 7-9 and 24 each depend from what Applicant believes to be an allowable claim, these claims are likewise allowable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The Examiner rejected claims 15, 17-18 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Densmore et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,187,786) in view of in view of Whitehead (U.S. Patent No. 6,085,030). The Examiner asserted that Densmore et al. discloses means for receiving requests to search a multi-element class path. The Examiner admitted that Densmore et al. fail to teach a wrapper associated with each element to invoke specific search methods. Regarding this deficiency, the Examiner asserted that Whitehead et al. teach “a wrapper for object in CORBA environment that invokes the object.” Applicant respectfully traverses.

Each of independent claims 15, 17-18 and 22 recite, *inter alia*, a wrapper for providing a level of indirection from APIs. As noted above, this feature advantageously enables the class path manager to make calls without having to be changed for different API calls as in the prior art and enables multiple different caches to be used for different elements. The wrapper disclosed in Whitehead et al. is used for non-CORBA objects, i.e., those objects that do not conform to the model. Thus, not all objects in Whitehead et al. have wrappers. Again, this teaches away from the present invention where wrappers are used for *all* elements. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The Examiner rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Densmore et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,187,786) in view of Whitehead (U.S. Patent No. 6,085,030) further in view of Brown et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,324,688). The Examiner asserted that Densmore et al. and Whitehead et al. disclose a class path manager as in claim 15, but fails to teach “wherein at least one such element specific search method comprises searching a cache associated with such element.” Regarding this deficiency, the Examiner asserted that Brown et al. teach a “Class loader for finding [a] class stored in the memory as requested by searching.” Applicant respectfully traverses.

Without addressing the propriety of the Examiner’s assertion, claim 16 depends from what Applicant believes to be an allowable base claim, thus claim 16 is likewise allowable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The Examiner rejected claims 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Densmore et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,187,786) in view of Whitehead (U.S. Patent No.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-0517
Application No.: 09/266,675
Office Action Dated: March 24, 2003

PATENT

6,085,030) further in view of Becker (U.S. Patent No. 5,937,411). The Examiner asserted that Densmore et al. and Whitehead et al. disclose a class path manager as in claim 15, but fails to teach zip files and a Java Package Manager. Regarding this deficiency, the Examiner asserted that Becker teach a zip file as claimed. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Without addressing the propriety of the Examiner's assertion, claims 19-21 depend from what Applicant believes to be an allowable base claim, thus claims 19-21 are likewise allowable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-0517
Application No.: 09/266,675
Office Action Dated: March 24, 2003


PATENT

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that each and every claim pending in this application patentably defines over the prior art of record. For all the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance.

Reconsideration of the present Office Action and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Date: July 22, 2003



Lawrence A. Aaronson
Registration No. 38,369

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439